



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,552	03/13/2004	Gerald B. Rosenberg	RSNB4000	7815

23488 7590 11/16/2006

GERALD B ROSENBERG
NEW TECH LAW
260 SHERIDAN AVENUE
SUITE 208
PALO ALTO, CA 94306-2009

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/799,552		ROSENBERG, GERALD B.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Miranda Le		2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-25 and 37-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26-36 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03/13/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 USC 121:

Group I: Claims 1-8, 26-29, 30-36 drawn to a computer system enabling user directed information research against an authoritatively organized document collection, classified in Class 707, subclass 102.

Group II, Claims 9-19, 20-25, 37-41, 42-43 drawn to a computer system providing a framework for information research over an authoritatively organized document collection, classified in Class 707, subclass 5.

An oral election was made with traverse of Group I, claims 1-8, 26-29, 30-36 by Mr. Gerald Rosendberg on November 10, 2006. Group II, claims 9-19, 20-25, 37-41, 42-43 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 33, line 5, either a semi-column or a column is needed after the word "mesh". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaufman et al. (US Patent No. 6,240,408).

Kaufman anticipated independent claims 1, 30 by the following:

As per claim 1, Kaufman teaches a computer system enabling user directed information research against an authoritatively organized document collection, said computer system comprising:

a) a database (*i.e. authoritative database, col. 3, lines 48-64*) storing first data identifying a set of authoritative statements (*i.e. the sentences, col. 3, lines 38-48*) present within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, second data specifying the locations (*i.e. the position of the sentence within the document, col. 3, lines 38-48*) of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection, third data specifying correlated associations (*i.e. weighting the contribution made by each sentence, col. 3, lines 38-48*) between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection (*i.e. candidate documents, col. 6, lines 1-8*) (*col. 3, lines 19-64; col. 12, lines 6-14*); and

b) a processor (*i.e. CPU 14 in Fig. 1*), coupleable to said database, operative to generate a mesh representational view (*Figs. 3, 4*) of the correlated associations between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions and wherein said processor is responsive to user input for navigation through said mesh representational view and user determined selection of a subset of said of authoritative assertions (*i.e. The calculation of query-word-conductance is*

Art Unit: 2167

illustrated in FIG. 3 for a representative query in which eight distinct query-words {t.sub.1, t.sub.2, . . . t.sub.8} are distributed among six sentences {s.sub.1, s.sub.2 . . . s.sub.6}. Because there are eight distinct query-words, there are eight query-word-conductances to be calculated, col. 7, lines 13-18) (col. 7, line 19 to col. 8, line 9; col. 9, line 24 to col. 10, line 45; col. 12, lines 6-14).

As per claim 30, Kaufman teaches an apparatus for processing a document collection to enable authoritative information research, said apparatus comprising:

a) a database (*i.e. authoritative database, col. 3, lines 48-64*) that provides for the storage of data with respect to a set of authoritative assertions occurring within the documents of a predetermined document collection (*col. 3, lines 19-64; col. 12, lines 6-14*); and

b) a processor (*i.e. CPU 14 in Fig. 1*) coupleable to access the documents of said predetermined document collection and further coupleable to store first (*i.e. the position of the sentence within the document, col. 3, lines 38-48*) and second data (*i.e. weighting the contribution made by each sentence, col. 3, lines 38-48*) to said database, said processor being operative to generate first data identifying said set of authoritative assertions, said first data further identifying the locations of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of a predetermined document collection, said processor being further operative to generate second data containing a weighted correlation of the mutual relative occurrence of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined document collection, and wherein said processor provides for the storage of said first and second data in said database, whereby said first and second data provides an authoritatively related basis

for analyzing the documents of said predetermined document collection (*i.e. candidate documents, col. 6, lines 1-8) (col. 3, lines 19-64; col. 12, lines 6-14).*

As per claim 2, Kaufman teaches said third data defines relative distance weighted, directional associations between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined authoritative document collection (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45).*

As per claim 31, Kaufman teaches said second data further contains weighted correlations representing semantic similarity of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45).*

As per claim 32, Kaufman teaches said first and second data defines a weighted correlation mesh interrelating the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45).*

As per claim 33, Kaufman teaches said weighted correlations include directional information reflecting the ordered of occurrence of the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions within the documents of said predetermined document collection such that said first and second data defines a directionally weighted correlation mesh, whereby said first and second data provides a directed basis for analyzing the ordered occurrence of conceptual

issues represented by sequences of authoritative assertions occurring within said set of authoritative assertions (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45*).

As per claim 34, Kaufman teaches said second data, as generated by said processor, correlates first and second predetermined authoritative assertions by a weighted ordered distance metric derived by analysis of the mutual relative locations of said first and second predetermined authoritative assertions within documents of co-occurrence of said predetermined document collection (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45*).

As per claim 35, Kaufman teaches said processor, in generating said second data, computes a semantic affinity metric for the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertion as a basis for establishing conceptual content associations between the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45*).

As per claim 36, Kaufman teaches said second data, as generated by said processor, includes cluster association information for the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions, wherein said cluster association information is determined based on said semantic affinity metric as computed for each of the authoritative assertions within said set of authoritative assertions (*col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 64; col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 36; col. 12, lines 6-45*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 3-8, 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaufman et al. (US Patent No. 6,240,408), in view of Farahat et al. (US Pub No. 20030226100).

As per claim 26, Kaufman teaches a computer-based system for developing a compilation of authoritative knowledge, said computer-based system comprising:

a) a first database of authoritative knowledge including a plurality of authoritative statements (*i.e. authoritative database, col. 3, lines 48-64*);

b) a second database of weight values interrelating said plurality of authoritative statements (*i.e. authoritative database, col. 3, lines 48-64*);

c) a viewer, coupled to said first and second databases, enabling presentation of a subset of said plurality of authoritative statements including a set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. The data analyzer 95 then ranks the candidate documents in the order of their overall similarity to the search query and presents the list of documents to the user, col. 12, lines 46-49*);

e) second controls, coupled to said viewer, operative to produce a report of said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. The selected document, col. 4, lines 56-61*).

Kaufman does not explicitly teach a set of supplemental authoritative statements, wherein said set of supplemental authoritative statements is selected based on associations determined from said second database of weight values and relative to said set of identified authoritative statements; and

d) first controls, coupled to said viewer, operative to influence the selection of said set of supplemental authoritative statements.

However, Farahat teaches:

a set of supplemental authoritative statements, wherein said set of supplemental authoritative statements is selected based on associations determined from said second database of weight values and relative to said set of identified authoritative statements (*i.e. outputting a textual authoritativeness value and/or a textual authority class for each evaluated document, [0018]; Figs. 13, 14*);

d) first controls, coupled to said viewer, operative to influence the selection of said set of supplemental authoritative statements (*i.e. web pages/web links, [0009]; Figs. 13, 14*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Kaufman and Farahat at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kaufman to include the above limitations as taught by Farahat. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to assign an authority class to web links pages that typically contain a short paragraph describing each link that occurs within that page in view of Farahat ([0073]), as doing so would give the added benefit of having combined textual

authoritativeness with social authority to provide a more complete and robust estimate of a document's authoritativeness as taught by Farahat ([0015]).

As per claim 3, Kaufman does not explicitly teach the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions are representable as nodes within said mesh representational view and wherein said third data determines the relative interconnection of said nodes within said mesh representational view.

However, Farahat teaches the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions are representable as nodes within said mesh representational view and wherein said third data determines the relative interconnection of said nodes within said mesh (*i.e. matrix*) representational view ([0101]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art having the teaching of Kaufman and Farahat at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kaufman to include the above limitations as taught by Farahat. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to combine textual authority with social authority in view of Farahat ([0101]), as doing so would give the added benefit of having combined textual authoritativeness with social authority to provide a more complete and robust estimate of a document's authoritativeness as taught by Farahat ([0015]).

As per claim 4, Farahat teaches said database further stores fourth data identifying authoritative citations in correspondence with the authoritative assertions of said set of authoritative assertions, wherein selection of said subset includes selection of the corresponding

authoritative citations, said processor being further operative to generate a literate report of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions and corresponding authoritative citations ([0019]).

As per claim 5, Farahat teaches generation of said literate report includes syntactic processing of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions ([0088-0101]; [0019; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 6, Farahat teaches generation of said literate report includes reformation of said corresponding authoritative citations dependent on the order of occurrence of said corresponding authoritative citations within said literate report ([0019; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 7, Farahat teaches generation of said literate report includes maintenance of predetermined report content provided in response to user input relative to said subset of said set of authoritative assertions and corresponding inclusion of said predetermined report content in said literate report ([0019; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 8, Farahat teaches said processor is operative to maintain source versions of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions, said corresponding authoritative citations, and said predetermined report content for reference in connection with the syntactic processing of said subset of said set of authoritative assertions, including said predetermined report content, and the reformation of said corresponding authoritative citations ([0088-0101; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 27, Farahat teaches said first controls are operative to include authoritative statements of said set of supplemental authoritative statements in said set of identified authoritative statements ([0088-0101; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 28, Farahat teaches a parser operative on said report to initially determine said set of identified authoritative statements ([0088-0101; 0113-0133]).

As per claim 29, Farahat teaches said report is a literate report of said set of identified authoritative statements ([0088-0101; 0113-0133]).

Conclusion


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham, can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax number to this Art Unit is (571)-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Miranda Le 
November 10, 2006


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100